Supercharge Your Wellness:
ADD 5 MUST-HAVE TINCTURES
to Your Daily Routine!
Power up your day with organic green tea tincture, daily immune complex blend, ashwagandha, and more
SHOP NOW
USDA ORGANIC

A Stanford doctor's 661 studies proving "vaccines are safe" crumbled under expert scrutiny presented by attorney Aaron Siri

09/13/2025 // Lance D Johnson // **330** Views

Tags: Aaron Siri, aluminum toxicity, badhealth, badmedicine, badscience, Big Pharma, CDC corruption, childhood vaccines, Dangerous Medicine, Dr. Jake Scott, Dr. Paul Thomas, Fact Check, FDA conflicts, Gardasil risks, Hepatitis B vaccine, informed consent, legal immunity, medical ethics, placebo trials, research, Supreme Court, unvaccinated study, Vaccine court, Vaccine injuries, vaccine safety, vaccine schedule

Stock up on Lab-Verified
ASTAXANTHIN
– Nature's most Powerful Antioxidant!
• Contains 12 mg of pure Natural Astaxanthin per softgel
• Non-GMO, NAXA-verified and non-irradiated
• Lab tested for glyphosate, heavy metals and microbiology
SHOP NOW ›

Such a watershed moment for medical freedom and truth: The experts were ready to take down the anti-vaxxers argument once and for all, in a Senate hearing room - the air thick with the kind of tension that comes when deeply held beliefs collide with cold, hard facts. On one side, Dr. Jake Scott, an infectious disease specialist from Stanford, sits confidently behind the table, armed with what he claims is irrefutable proof — 661 placebo-controlled trials demonstrating the safety of childhood vaccines. His database, he boasts, is a fortress of transparency, a shield against the "misinformation" peddled by vaccine skeptics. But then, like a prosecutor dismantling a flimsy alibi, attorney Aaron Siri begins to peel back the layers of Scott's claims. One by one, the studies evaporate under scrutiny. What remains isn't a mountain of evidence — it's a mirage, a carefully constructed illusion designed to prop up an industry that has long operated beyond accountability.

This wasn't just an academic spat. It was a moment that laid bare a troubling reality: The medical establishment, the agencies tasked with protecting public health, and the doctors we trust to guide our most personal decisions have been selling us a narrative about vaccine safety that doesn't hold up under the slightest pressure. And if a Stanford physician —

someone with the resources of one of the world's most prestigious institutions behind him — couldn't produce a single valid study to prove the safety of the childhood vaccine schedule, what does that say about the foundation on which we've built our trust?

Key points:

- **No true placebos, no real science:** Not one of the 661 studies Dr. Jake Scott cited used an inert placebo (like saline) to test childhood vaccines on the CDC schedule. Instead, most compared vaccines to other vaccines or substances with known biological effects, rendering the results meaningless for assessing safety.

- **A system built on legal immunity:** Vaccines are the only medical product granted near-total liability protection. The Supreme Court has ruled them "unavoidably unsafe," yet parents are bullied into compliance while injuries are dismissed in a secretive Vaccine Court where fewer than one percent of claims are compensated.

- **The body burden question no one is asking:** No studies have ever examined the cumulative effect of injecting multiple vaccines — each containing aluminum, formaldehyde, and other toxins — into a developing infant's body. Doctors like Dr. Paul Thomas, who dared to study unvaccinated children, found they were healthier than their vaccinated peers — and faced professional ruin for it.

- **The financial carrot (and stick):** Doctors receive bonuses for high vaccination rates in their practices, while parents who question the schedule are labeled "anti-science." Meanwhile, the CDC and FDA are riddled with conflicts of interest, from revolving doors with pharmaceutical companies to industry-funded research.

- **An ethical reckoning for Dr. Scott:** Now that he knows the truth — that his database was a house of cards — does he have a moral obligation to correct the record? Or will he, like so many before him, retreat into the safety of institutional dogma?

The database that wasn't: How 661 studies became zero

When Dr. Jake Scott took the stand, he did so with the swagger of a man who believed he held the winning hand. His database, he claimed, was a comprehensive rebuttal to those who dared question the orthodoxy of vaccine safety. "This is what transparency looks like," he declared, as if the mere existence of 661 studies should silence all dissent. But transparency, as it turns out, is only as good as the integrity of the data — and Scott's data was rotten to the core.

Aaron Siri, a lawyer who has spent years fighting for families injured by vaccines, didn't need a sledgehammer to demolish Scott's argument. A scalpel would do. Methodically, he carved

away the layers of deception:

- **First, 567 of the 661 studies were for vaccines not even on the CDC's childhood schedule** — things like HIV vaccines or travel vaccines for adults. Irrelevant. A distraction.

- **Then, of the 94 studies left, 70 didn't involve healthy children**. They tested vaccines on HIV-positive adults, the elderly, or other populations that tell us nothing about how a two-month-old's immune system might react to a cocktail of antigens and adjuvants.

- **Finally, that left 24 studies.** But here's where the shell game gets really brazen. Twenty-one of those used control groups that were given other biologically active substances — like a different vaccine, or an aluminum adjuvant (a known neurotoxin), or a witch's brew of chemicals like polysorbate 80 and sodium borate. In one Gardasil trial, the "placebo" group was given everything in the vaccine except the antigen — meaning they were still exposed to the same toxic stew, just without the one ingredient that might (theoretically) provoke an immune response. It's like testing the safety of a cigarette by comparing it to a cigarette without nicotine. The paper burns either way.

- **The final three studies?** One used neomycin, an antibiotic that can cause allergic reactions when applied to the skin — let alone injected. Another was a Gardasil trial where the control group had already received three doses of a previous version of the vaccine. The third was so flawed it barely warranted discussion.

- **Zero:** That's how many studies actually used a true placebo — saline, sterile water — to test the safety of a childhood vaccine on the CDC schedule.

Scott, caught flat-footed, could only sputter that Siri couldn't possibly have reviewed all 661 studies. The irony was rich: He hadn't even reviewed them. He'd simply compiled a list, assumed it proved his point, and expected no one to look too closely. But that's the thing about illusions — they only work if the audience doesn't ask for a closer inspection.

The legal shield: Why vaccines are the only product you can't sue over

If vaccines were as safe as we're told, why do they enjoy a legal protection no other medical product does? In 1986, Congress passed the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, which did two critical things: It created the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP) — a.k.a. the "Vaccine Court" — and it granted pharmaceutical companies near-total immunity from lawsuits for injuries caused by vaccines.

Here's how it works: If your child is injured by a vaccine, you can't sue the manufacturer. Instead, you must petition the VICP, a special court where the burden of proof is so high that fewer than one percent of claims are compensated. The process is slow, opaque, and stacked against families. Even when injuries are acknowledged, the payouts are limited, and the details are often sealed.

The Supreme Court doubled down on this protection in 2011, ruling in *Bruesewitz v. Wyeth* that vaccines are "unavoidably unsafe" — meaning their risks are inherent to their design — and that manufacturers cannot be held liable for injuries, even if they could have made the product safer. Think about that: No other industry — not cars, not guns, not prescription drugs — gets this kind of free pass. If a pharmaceutical company makes a defective drug, you can sue. If a car manufacturer cuts corners on safety, you can sue. But if a vaccine maims your child? You're out of luck.

This legal shield doesn't just protect companies — it removes all incentive to make vaccines safer. Why conduct rigorous long-term studies when you'll never be held accountable for the fallout? Why test the cumulative effect of injecting 72 doses of 16 different vaccines into a child by age 18 when the worst that can happen is a payout from a government fund?

The children no one is allowed to study

In 2020, Dr. Paul Thomas, a pediatrician with decades of experience, published a study that should have shaken the medical world to its core. He compared 560 unvaccinated children to 2,900 variably vaccinated children, using age-matched controls to ensure accuracy. His findings?

- Unvaccinated children had fewer infections — of any kind.
- They had lower rates of neurodevelopmental disorders, like autism and ADHD.
- They suffered less from allergies, eczema, and chronic illnesses.

In other words, the children who received no vaccines were, by nearly every measure, healthier than their vaccinated peers. This wasn't just a fluke — it was a direct challenge to the core assumption that vaccines make us safer as a society. If unvaccinated kids aren't just not spreading disease but are actually healthier, what does that say about the risks we've been told are worth taking?

The response from the medical establishment wasn't curiosity. It was fury. The Oregon Medical Board suspended Dr. Thomas's license just five days after his study was published. His crime? Daring to ask a question no one in power wanted answered.

Then there's the complete absence of research on the cumulative effect of the vaccine schedule. No one has ever studied what happens when you inject a six-month-old with eight vaccines in one day, as the CDC schedule recommends. No one has tested how aluminum — a known neurotoxin — accumulates in the brain when given repeatedly in doses far exceeding what the FDA considers safe for intravenous feeding.

And yet, doctors like Dr. Jake Scott will stand before the Senate and insist that the science is settled. That the risks are minimal. That parents who hesitate are ignorant, selfish, or dangerous.

Dr. Jake Scott now has an ethical duty to tell the truth now

Dr. Jake Scott now faces a choice. He can double down, retreat into the safety of institutional approval, and pretend his database wasn't a house of cards. Or he can do what every ethical scientist should do when confronted with evidence that undermines their beliefs: He can change his mind.

He could start by acknowledging that no true placebo-controlled trials exist for the childhood vaccine schedule. He could demand that the CDC and FDA fund independent research on the cumulative effects of vaccines. He could call for an end to the legal immunity that shields manufacturers from accountability. He could, in short, become part of the solution instead of a pawn in a system that has lost its way.

But will he? History suggests that institutions protect their own, and the medical-industrial complex is no exception. The real question is whether the rest of us will continue to play along — or whether we'll demand the transparency, the rigor, and the respect we deserve.

Because here's the truth: This isn't about "anti-vax" vs. "pro-vax." It's about informed consent. It's about bodily autonomy. It's about a system that has failed to do its most basic job — proving that the products it mandates are safe. And if a Stanford doctor can't produce a single valid study to back up his claims, maybe it's time we all start asking: What else aren't they telling us?

Sources include:

ChildrensHealthDefense.org

ChildrensHealthDefense.org

Senate.gov [PDF]

RELATED TOPICS

AARON SIRI | ALUMINUM TOXICITY | BADHEALTH | BADMEDICINE | BADSCIENCE | BIG PHARMA | CDC CORRUPTION | CHILDHOOD VACCINES | DANGEROUS MEDICINE | DR. JAKE SCOTT | DR. PAUL THOMAS | FACT CHECK | FDA CONFLICTS | GARDASIL RISKS | HEPATITIS B VACCINE | INFORMED CONSENT | LEGAL IMMUNITY | MEDICAL ETHICS | PLACEBO TRIALS | RESEARCH | SUPREME COURT | UNVACCINATED STUDY | VACCINE COURT | VACCINE INJURIES | VACCINE SAFETY | VACCINE SCHEDULE

LATEST NEWS

09/13/2025 / By Lance D Johnson

The primary compound in ginger ACTIVATES immune cells

09/13/2025 / By S.D. Wells

Are you CAUGHT UP in a TOXIC RELATIONSHIP? You may be and not even realize it, so here are some ways to recognize it and heal, naturally

09/13/2025 / By Ava Grace

Landmark report links Canadian COVID-19 policies to surge in unexplained deaths

09/13/2025 / By Belle Carter

Germany plans major military expansion amid rising tensions with Russia

09/13/2025 / By Patrick Lewis

FDA, CBP seize $86.5M worth of unauthorized e-cigarettes

09/13/2025 / By Ava Grace

Revolutionary keratin toothpaste could end dental drilling

TOOTHSALT WITH NEEM
Fluoride-free and lab tested for glyphosate, heavy metals, and microbiology
TOOTHSALT WITH NEEM
SHOP NOW

RELATED NEWS



09/05/2025 / By Lance D Johnson

Florida shatters the chains of medical tyranny: Surgeon General declares war on vaccine mandates in historic stand for bodily autonomy

07/26/2025 / By Lance D Johnson

Researchers who tried to bury the aluminum-autism link now face calls to RETRACT their fraudulent study

HRR
DR. SHERRI TENPENNY INTERVIEWED BY MIKE ADAMS:
SURVEILLED AND INJECTED: DR. SHERRI TENPENNY
ON AI'S THREAT TO HEALTH FREEDOM

06/27/2025 / By Finn Heartley

AI doctors on the horizon? Pharma could replace human physicians with algorithmic prescriptions



06/12/2025 / By Lance D Johnson

Kennedy dismantles CDC vaccine panel, appoints NEW COMMITTEE to challenge the toxic one-size-fits-all CDC mandates

06/09/2025 / By Jacob Thomas

"Healing Revolution" on BrightU: Chemicals, additives and control

06/05/2025 / By Lance D Johnson

New research exposes how vaccines trigger SIDS — medical establishment covering up infant deaths with MISDIAGNOSIS

3 COMMENTS

Newest | Oldest | Most Replies

Please sign in with your Brighteon account to leave comments

Not a user, Create your FREE account today.
Learn more about our new comment system.

Sign In Sign Up

NoHomeport
6 hours ago

This is all from an attorney, not an immunologist or epidemiologist?

0 0 1 Reply

Dave Gayon
13 hours ago • edited

Excellent article and completely true. Vaccines were completely safe and effective until Fauci took over the CDC, purged out all the Epidemiologists and turned the CDC into a criminal organization that had its own foundation that had Big Pharma pumping mega
See more

0 0

Couchpotato
16 hours ago

Dr. Jake Scott is an Order Follower. He will never stand up for the truth. He will say or do anything, even to the point of slaughtering children, to keep his fat paycheck. He has no brain of his own. On the other hand, Dr. Paul Thomas and Attorney Aaron Siri are
See more


"Order followers are the equivalent of modern day house slaves, who would rather enslave their brothers and sisters, than grow up, develop real courage and think for themselves."
- Mark Passio

1 0 1 Reply

TAKE ACTION:

Support Natural News by linking to this article from your website.

Permalink to this article:

https://www.naturalnews.com/2025-09-13-661-studies-fail-to-prove-vaccine-safety.html Copy

Embed article link:

<a href="https://www.naturalnews.com/2025-09-13-661-studies-fail-to-prove-vaccine-safety.html">A Stanford doct Copy

Reprinting this article:

Non-commercial use is permitted with credit to NaturalNews.com (including a clickable link).
Please contact us for more information.

FREE EMAIL ALERTS

Get independent news alerts on natural cures, food lab tests, cannabis medicine, science, robotics, drones, privacy and more.

Enter Your Email Address

We respect your privacy

Download on the App Store | Install for Android | AI Powered by Brighteon.AI

This site is part of the Natural News Network © 2022 All Rights Reserved. Privacy | Terms All content posted on this site is commentary or opinion and is protected under Free Speech. Truth Publishing International, LTD. is not responsible for content written by contributing authors. The information on this site is provided for educational and entertainment purposes only. It is not intended as a substitute for professional advice of any kind. Truth Publishing assumes no responsibility for the use or misuse of this material. Your use of this website indicates your agreement to these terms and those published here. All trademarks, registered trademarks and servicemarks mentioned on this site are the property of their respective owners.